

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 13-21, 24, 26-30 and 40-41 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 10 and 27 are amended and claims 11, 22, 23, 25 and 42 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance; (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and/or (3) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. More specifically, the above amendments are merely for clarity of previously-claimed subject matter. Entry is thus proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 8-11, 13-19, 21-30 and 40-42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0024657 to Wright et al. (hereafter Wright) in view of JP 0621722 to Hayashi, U.S. Patent 6,757,837 to Platt and newly-cited U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0137762 to Rother. The Office Action also rejects claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wright in view of Hayashi, Platt, Rother and U.S. Patent 6,542,897 to Lee. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a storing unit for storing proper information of the TV, and contact information of a certain site, the proper information including a model name or a model number of the TV. Independent claim 1 also recites a controlling unit for contacting the certain site and for transmitting the proper information from the TV to the certain site in response to a checkup key signal inputted by a user, and the controlling unit for controlling displaying of

Reply to Office Action dated December 11, 2008

information corresponding to function information and an error checkup menu of the TV received from the Internet based on the proper information of the TV and the contact information. Independent claim 1 also recites that the storing unit storing the proper information of the TV prior to the controlling unit contacting the certain site. Independent claim 1 further recites that the controlling unit receives an error list of the TV from the certain site when an error that occurred in the TV is not a fatal error, and the controlling unit automatically sets data or state of the TV regarding the error as a standard state (forwarding state) based on information included in the received error list of the TV.

The applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. More specifically, the Office Action (on pages 3-4) states that Wright and Hayashi do not teach or suggest receiving an error list at a controlling unit from a certain site when an error that occurred is not a fatal error, and the controlling unit automatically restores the error based on information included in the received error list of the TV. Platt also does not suggest these features. The Office Action (on page 4) then cites Rother's paragraphs [0021] and [0049] for features relating to an error check up menu.

Rother merely discloses a diagnosis platform 10 for a vehicle. See FIG. 1. The system allows a user to diagnose problems of the vehicle. Rother relates to error checkup by a one-way communication (as compared to a two-way communication between entities). Rother does not relate to "transmitting the proper information from the TV to the certain site." Stated differently, Rother does not relate to two-way communications to determine an error checkup. Rother does not teach or suggest that a controlling unit receives an error list of the TV from the

Reply to Office Action dated December 11, 2008

certain site when an error that occurred in the TV is not a fatal error, as recited in independent claim 1. Rother also does not teach or suggest that the controlling unit automatically sets data or state of the TV regarding the error as a standard state (forwarding state) based on information included in the received error list of the TV. Rother does not suggest these missing features relating to a certain site.

Additionally, Wright and Platt do not teach or suggest automatically setting the data or state of the TV regarding the error as a standard state (forwarding state) based on information included in the error list of the TV. Hayashi also does not teach or suggest these features.

For at least these reasons, Wright, Hayashi, Platt and Rother do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 10 recites contacting a certain service-related site by referencing contact information of the certain site stored in advance at the TV, and transmitting proper information of the TV from the TV to the certain site when a checkup key signal is inputted by a user, the proper information including a model name or a model number of the TV stored on the TV prior to contacting the certain site. Independent claim 10 also recites receiving, at the TV, service menu information corresponding to the TV after the proper information of the TV is transmitted to the certain site, selecting information from the received service menu information at the TV, receiving, at the TV, the selected information from the service menu information, and displaying the selected information on a screen of the TV. Still further, independent claim 10 recites receiving an error list of the TV from the certain site when an error

that occurred in the TV is not a fatal error, and automatically setting data or state of the TV regarding the error as a standard state (forwarding state) based on information included in the error list of the TV.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Wright, Hayashi, Platt and Rother do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 10. More specifically, Rother (and the other applied references) does not teach or suggest receiving an error list of the TV from the certain site when an error that occurred in the TV is not a fatal error. Rother (and the other applied references) also does not teach or suggest automatically setting data or state of the TV regarding the error as a standard state (forwarding state) based on information included in the error list of the TV. Thus, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 27 recites that the television controlling unit receives an error list of the television from the Internet site when an error that occurred in the television is not a fatal error, and the television controlling unit automatically sets data or state of the television regarding the error as a standard state (forwarding state) based on information included in the received error list of the television.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, Wright, Hayashi, Platt and Rother do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 27. Thus, independent claim 27 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 10 and 27 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the

Serial No. **09/842,082**
Reply to Office Action dated December 11, 2008

Docket No. **P-0222**

dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-6, 8-10, 13-21, 24, 26-30 and 40-41 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

Date: March 5, 2009

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610